

IPM

Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program

Northeastern Region

Guidelines for Application Preparation and Submission Fiscal Year 2004

Land Grant University System and
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Due Dates:

Letter of Intent: November 3, 2003

Application: December 1, 2003

**LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AND COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH,
EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
REGIONAL INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT COMPETITIVE GRANTS
PROGRAM – NORTHEAST REGION**

INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE: Projects awarded under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, ch. 79, 38 Stat. 372, 7 U.S.C. 341 et seq. can be found in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.500. Projects awarded under Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law No. 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i (c)(1)(B)) can be found in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.200.

DATES: A letter of intent to submit an application must be received by close of business (COB) on November 3, 2003 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time) in order to submit an application for consideration. An application will not be accepted if a letter of intent was not submitted in accordance with instructions in this Request for Applications (RFA). Applications must be received by COB on December 1, 2003 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). Any applications received after this deadline will not be considered for funding. Comments regarding this RFA are requested within six months from the issuance of this notice. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT: The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), USDA is requesting comments regarding this RFA from any interested party. These comments will be considered in the development of the next RFA for the program. Such comments will be used to meet the requirements of section 103(c)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(c)(2)). This section requires the Secretary to solicit and consider input on a current RFA from persons who conduct or use agricultural research, education and extension for use in formulating future RFAs for competitive programs. Comments should be submitted by the deadline noted in the **DATES** portion of this Notice.

Written stakeholder comments should be submitted by mail to: Policy and Program Liaison Staff; Office of Extramural Programs; USDA CSREES; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: RFP-OEP@csrees.usda.gov. (This e-mail address is intended only for receiving comments regarding this RFA and not requesting information or forms.) In your comments, please state that you are responding to the FY 2004 Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program RFA for the Northeastern Region.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: CSREES requests applications for the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program for fiscal year (FY) 2004 to support the continuum of research and extension efforts needed to increase the implementation of integrated pest management (IPM) methods. The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports projects that develop individual pest control tactics, integrate individual tactics into an IPM system, and develop and implement extension education programs. The program is administered by the land-grant university system's four regions (North Central, Northeastern, Southern, Western) in partnership with CSREES. In FY 2004, CSREES anticipates that approximately \$610,000 will

be available for support of the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Northeastern Region (NE-IPM). Of this amount, up to \$100,000 will be set aside to fund research or extension projects that require relatively small budgets (\$15,000 maximum for up to two years) to complete critical steps in the development or implementation of IPM programs. The remaining funds will fund more traditional projects as described in this RFA. Approximately \$265,000 is expected to be available for research projects, \$70,000 for extension projects and \$175,000 for joint research-extension projects.

This notice identifies the objectives for NE-IPM projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for a NE-IPM grant. CSREES additionally requests stakeholder input from any interested party for use in the development of the next RFA for this program.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background	5
B. Purpose and Priorities	5

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding	7
B. Types of Applications	7
C. Project Types	8
D. Multi-state and Multi-region Projects	9

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants	10
B. Cost Sharing or Matching	10

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Address to Request Application Package	11
B. Content and Form of Application Submission	11
C. Submission Dates and Times	19
D. Funding Restrictions	19
E. Other Submission Requirements	19

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General	21
B. Evaluation Criteria	21
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality	25

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General	26
B. Organizational Management Information	26
C. Award Notice	26

D. Administrative and National Policy Requirements	27
E. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements	28
PART VII—PROGRAM CONTACT	29
PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION	
A. Access to Review Information	30
B. Use of Funds; Changes	30
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards	31
D. Regulatory Information	31

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background

Authority for the funding of research projects is contained in Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law No. 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i (c)(1)(B)). Authority for the funding of extension projects is contained in Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, ch. 79, 38 Stat. 372, 7 U.S.C. 341 et seq. For combined effort applications, separate awards will be executed for P.L. 89-106 and Smith-Lever funds.

The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports the continuum of research and extension efforts needed to increase the implementation of IPM methods. The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports projects that develop individual pest control tactics, integrate individual tactics into an IPM system, and develop and implement extension and education programs. The program is administered by the land-grant university system's four regions (North Central, Northeastern, Southern, Western) in partnership with CSREES.

The goal of the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program is to provide knowledge and information needed for the implementation of IPM methods that: 1) safeguard human health and the environment; and 2) increase the range of benefits achieved by those who use IPM methods. The IPM Competitive Grants Program contributes to the achievement of this goal by increasing the supply and dissemination of IPM knowledge and by enhancing collaboration among stakeholders. It is recognized that the specific needs of each region vary, and thus specific program priorities will vary among the four regions.

B. Purpose and Priorities

In FY 2004, NE-IPM will give priority to applications that address or include:

1. Stakeholder Involvement

The Northeastern Region is committed to addressing the pest management needs expressed by diverse stakeholders. Applications must include explicit citations that document the stakeholder-identified needs addressed by the proposed project. Links to some sources of stakeholder-identified priorities can be found on the Northeastern IPM Internet site at <http://northeastipm.org/partners/priorities.html>. Sources of stakeholder-identified needs include, but are not limited to:

- (a) National IPM Initiative Phase I project reports (available online at <http://www.northeastipm.org/reports/phaseone/index.html>);
- (b) Recommendations or reports from program advisory committees;
- (c) Recommendations from stakeholder groups; and
- (d) Other documented needs assessment evaluations.

Explicitly citing such sources demonstrates both that a project is important, and that the Project Directors (PDs) and the grants program are engaged within the community.

2. Non-Pesticidal Tactics

NE-IPM encourages projects that develop, promote or implement non-pesticidal tactics.

3. Multi-State Involvement

NE-IPM encourages collaborations among state programs for purposes of efficiency, economy, and synergy. Applications must project benefits to more than one state. Projects involving multi-state collaboration are preferred, but those undertaken by PDs in a single state that will benefit other states in the region are also encouraged. (See Part III, A., Eligible Applicants, for further information on cooperative projects.)

4. Base Priorities

The base priorities of NE-IPM include:

- (a) Environmental stewardship and risk management: NE-IPM will support and promote projects that significantly enhance and protect environmental quality and reduce the risk of health and other problems associated with pest management.
- (b) Importance and value of the crop or cropping system to the Northeastern Region: NE-IPM will support and promote projects that have potential benefits to several or all states in the region.
- (c) Importance of the pest or pest complex to the crop or cropping system: NE-IPM will support and promote projects focused on managing pests or pest complexes that have significant impacts or potential impacts on the crop or crop system.
- (d) Likelihood of implementation: NE-IPM will support and promote projects of sound design that are most likely to be broadly implemented at the producer level across a cropping system.

5. Annual Emphases

NE-IPM is particularly interested in funding projects that:

- (a) Address management of important weed pests; and
- (b) Address management of important vertebrate pests (i.e., pests that are classified as vertebrates, for example: birds on blueberries or deer on sweet corn).

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding

There is no commitment by USDA to fund any particular application or to make a specific number of awards. Approximately \$610,000 is expected to be available to fund NE-IPM applications in FY 2004. Of this amount, approximately \$265,000 is expected to be available for research projects, \$70,000 for extension projects and \$175,000 for joint research-extension projects. Individual grant duration and maximum fund availability depend on the project type and the degree of collaboration among states in the Northeastern Region (see Part III, A., Eligible Applicants, and Part II, C., Project Types, for more information). In FY 2004, up to \$100,000 will be set aside to fund small, low budget projects that will complete critical steps in the development or implementation of IPM programs (see Part II, C., 4., Project Types, for more information).

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2004, NE-IPM applications may be submitted as one of the following types of requests:

1. New Application

This is a project application that has not been previously submitted to NE-IPM. All new applications will be reviewed competitively using the selection process and evaluation criteria described in Part IV.

2. Renewal Application

This is a project application that requests additional funding for a project beyond the period approved in an original or amended award. Renewal applications must be received by the application due date, will be evaluated in competition with other pending applications in appropriate areas to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

3. Resubmitted Application

This is an application that had previously been submitted to NE-IPM but was not funded. PDs must respond to the previous review panel summary (see Part IV, B., 5., Response to Previous Review). Resubmitted applications must be received by the application due date, will be evaluated in competition with other pending applications in appropriate areas to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

4. Resubmitted Renewal Application

This is a project application that requests additional funding for a project beyond the period approved in the original award. In addition, this is an application that had previously been submitted for renewal to the NE-IPM but was not approved. Therefore, PDs must respond to the previous review panel summary as required under Part IV, B., 5., Response to Previous Review. Resubmitted renewal applications must be received by the application due date, will be evaluated in competition with other pending applications in appropriate areas to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

C. Project Types

The NE-IPM solicits applications for the following three types of projects in FY 2004. Applicants must indicate the type of project they are proposing.

1. Research

This funding category develops the research base needed for the construction of comprehensive pest management systems that have a strong likelihood of contributing to on-going IPM implementation efforts. Research may be proposed to develop individual tactics needed for pest management systems (e.g., biocontrol, cultural control, host resistance) or to increase the understanding of how interactions among tactics alter the effectiveness of pest management systems tactics within agricultural, forest, suburban, and urban ecosystems. The experimental approach should emphasize field-scale experiments over multiple seasons and/or locations where appropriate. Practices should be designed to reduce initial pest populations, lower the carrying capacity of the ecosystem for pests, and/or increase tolerance of hosts to pest injury. Long-term fundamental research is not appropriate for funding. Research involving chemical pesticides should be designed to reduce the amount and frequency and increase selectivity of pesticide application in order to minimize adverse impacts on beneficial organisms and to limit buildup of pest populations that are resistant to pesticides. Applications should clearly demonstrate how the tactic or IPM system, once developed, can be incorporated into an existing production system. Projects funded in this category should demonstrate economic, social, and environmental benefits of IPM strategies, and identify constraints to greater adoption of IPM systems by users.

Research applications with PDs from a single or multiple institutions in only one state may be submitted for a duration of up to 3 years and a maximum total project budget of \$60,000.

Research applications with PDs from more than one state in the Northeastern Region may be submitted for a duration of up to 3 years with a maximum total project budget of \$180,000. See Section D. of this part for project limits that apply to multi-state and multi-region projects.

2. Extension

This funding category enhances outreach efforts that support the wide-scale implementation of IPM methods and maximize opportunities to build strategic alliances with industry and user groups to expand their active participation in increasing the adoption of IPM methods. Projects may be proposed to develop educational materials and information delivery systems needed for outreach efforts, conduct field-scale or on-farm demonstrations, or deliver IPM education and training. A research component is not a required element of extension projects, but the research base should be documented.

Extension applications with PDs from a single or multiple institutions in only one state may be submitted for a duration of up to 3 years and a maximum total project budget of \$50,000.

Extension applications with PDs from more than one state in the Northeastern Region may be submitted for a duration of up to 3 years with a maximum total project budget of \$70,000. See Section D. of this part for project limits that apply to multi-state and multi-region projects.

3. Joint Research-Extension

This funding category combines research and extension activities (as described in 1. and 2., above). Joint research-extension projects validate pest management systems, introduce new pest

management tactics into local production systems, and deliver these systems to producers and their advisors through IPM education and training programs. The project team should include both researchers and extension educators with appointments in research and extension.

Joint research-extension applications with PDs from a single or multiple institutions in only one state may be submitted for a duration of up to 3 years and a maximum total project budget of \$60,000. Joint research-extension applications with PDs from more than one state in the Northeast may be submitted for a duration of up to 3 years with a maximum total project budget of \$175,000. See Section D. of this part for project limits that apply to multi-state and multi-region projects.

4. Critical Step

Up to \$100,000 will be made available to fund proposed research or extension projects that require relatively small budgets to complete critical steps in the development or implementation of IPM programs. Applications may be submitted for a duration of up to 2 years with a minimum total budget of \$5,000 and a maximum total budget of \$15,000. Research projects should demonstrate the potential to significantly impact the development of IPM tactics and strategies. Extension projects should demonstrate the potential to significantly increase or improve implementation of IPM tactics and strategies in the field. Critical step applications will be reviewed by the same panels that review the other NE-IPM applications; however, reviewers will apply slightly different evaluation criteria to these applications to de-emphasize multi-state and multi-institutional aspects, and highlight the potential for near-term, important contributions (see Part V, B.).

D. Multi-state and Multi-region Projects

If PDs from only one Northeastern Region state are involved with an institution outside the Northeastern Region, project limits are \$60,000 for any project. If PDs from more than one Northeastern Region state are involved with an institution outside the Northeastern Region, project limits are \$180,000 for research projects, \$70,000 for extension projects, and \$180,000 for joint research-extension projects. The maximum project term is 3 years for such projects.

Co-PDs from multiple institutions have options for the structure of the project. A discussion of these options can be accessed online at: <http://northeastipm.org/ripm/fy2003/grantpartners.html>.

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Eligibility for research projects includes: state agricultural experiment stations, land-grant colleges and universities, research foundations established by land-grant colleges and universities, colleges and universities receiving funds under the Act of October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.), and accredited schools or colleges of veterinary medicine. Eligibility for extension projects is limited to land-grant colleges and universities. Award recipients may subcontract to organizations not eligible to apply, provided such organizations are necessary for the conduct of the project.

Applications that entail cooperation with PDs at institutions outside the Northeastern Region are encouraged and will be considered if the lead PD is employed at a qualified institution within the Northeastern Region.

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

There are no matching requirements associated with the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Address to Request Application Package

Program application materials are available at the following CSREES web site:

<http://www.reeusda.gov/agsys/ipm/forms.htm>. If you do not have access to the web page or have trouble downloading material and you would like hard copies of the forms, you may contact Dr. John Ayers at (814) 865-7776.

B. Content and Form of Application Submission

The applications should be prepared following the guidelines and the instructions below. Each application must contain the following elements in the order indicated:

1. General

Use the following guidelines to prepare an application. Proper preparation of applications will assist reviewers in evaluating the merits of each application in a systematic, consistent fashion.

(a) Prepare the application on only one side of the page using standard size (8 1/2" x 11") white paper with one-inch margins, type or word process using no type smaller than 12-point font, and single-space the document. Use an easily readable font face (e.g., Geneva, Helvetica, Times Roman), and number each page sequentially.

(b) Staple the application in the upper left-hand corner. Do not bind. The original and 12 copies of the application (13 total) must be submitted in one package. The original and twelve (12) copies of the Relevance Statement must accompany these documents (see (e), below).

(c) Include original illustrations (photographs, color prints, etc.) in all copies of the application to prevent loss of meaning through poor quality reproduction.

(d) The contents of the application should be assembled in the following order:

- (1) Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002)
- (2) Table of Contents
- (3) Project Summary (Form CSREES-2003)
- (4) Response to Previous Review
- (5) Project Description
- (6) References
- (7) Appendices to Project Description
- (8) Key Personnel
- (9) Collaborative Arrangements (including Letters of Support)
- (10) Conflict-of-Interest List (Form CSREES-2007)
- (11) Budget (Form CSREES-2004 or CSREES-55 as appropriate)
- (12) Budget Narrative
- (13) Current and Pending Support (Form CSREES-2005)
- (14) Assurance Statement(s) (Form CSREES-2008)
- (15) Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Form CSREES-2006)

(16) Page B, Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002), Personal Data on Project Director

(e) A Relevance Statement should be included that describes the relevance of the project to NE-IPM priorities (see Part I, B.). The Relevance Statement is the only part of the submission that will be viewed by the Relevance (Merit) Review Panel. Conversely, it is the only part of the submission that the Technical Review Panel will not view.

The Relevance Statement should be submitted with, but not attached to, the full application. Formatting requirements (font, spacing, margins) for the Relevance Statement are the same as those for the application. The Relevance Statement should contain the following information. The Project Summary ((3) below) should not exceed one page in length. The description of the problem, background and justification ((5) below) should not exceed three pages in length.

- (1) Names and institutions of PDs and major cooperators
- (2) Project title
- (3) Project summary (copied directly from the application)
- (4) Project objectives. Do not exceed one page.
- (5) Description of the problem, background and justification: (may be copied from the application, as long as the three-page limit is not exceeded)
 - Indicate how the project addresses stakeholder-identified priorities and reference or quote those priorities.
 - Indicate how the project develops, promotes and/or implements non-pesticidal tactics.
 - Discuss the level of multi-state involvement in the project and potential multi-state impacts resulting from the project.
 - Discuss the problem importance in terms of environmental stewardship and risk management, importance of the crop or setting regionally, and importance of the pest(s) within the setting.
 - Discuss probability of project results being widely implemented.
 - Address whether the project addresses either of the NE-IPM annual emphases.

2. Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002)

(a) Page A

Each copy of each grant application must contain a Proposal Cover Page, Form CSREES-2002. One copy of the application, preferably the original, must contain the pen-and-ink signature(s) of the proposing PDs and the authorized organizational representative (AOR), the individual who possesses the necessary authority to commit the organization's time and other relevant resources to the project. If there are more than three co-PDs for an application, please list additional co-PDs on a separate sheet of paper (with appropriate information and signatures) and attach to the Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002). Any proposed PD or co-PD whose signature does not appear on Form CSREES-2002 or attached additional sheets will not be listed on any resulting grant award. Complete both signature blocks located at the bottom of the Proposal Cover Page form. Please note that Form CSREES-2002 is comprised of two parts - Page A, which is the Proposal Cover Page, and Page B, which is the Personal Data on Project Director. Applications received without appropriate signatures by the specified deadline will not be considered for funding.

Form CSREES-2002 serves as a source document for the CSREES grant database; it is therefore important that it be accurately completed in its entirety, especially the e-mail addresses requested in Blocks 4.c. and 18.c. However, the following items are highlighted as having a high potential for errors or misinterpretations:

- (1) Type of Performing Organization (Block 6.a. and 6.b.). For Block 6.a., a check should be placed in the appropriate box to identify the type of organization that is the legal recipient named in Block 1. Only one box should be checked. For Block 6.b., please check as many boxes that apply to the affiliation of the PD listed in Block 16.
- (2) Title of Proposed Project (Block 7.). The title of the project must be brief (140 character maximum, including spaces), yet represent the major thrust of the effort being proposed. Project titles are read by a variety of nonscientific people; therefore, highly technical words or phraseology should be avoided where possible. In addition, introductory phrases such as "investigation of," "research on," "education for," or "outreach that" should not be used.
- (3) Type of Request (Block 14.). Check the block for New, Renewal, Resubmitted, or Resubmitted Renewal.
- (4) Project Director (PD) (Blocks 16.-19.). Blocks 16.-18 are used to identify the PD and Block 19. to identify co-PDs. If needed, additional co-PDs may be listed on a separate sheet of paper and attached to Form CSREES-2002, the Proposal Cover Page, with the applicable co-PD information and signatures. Listing multiple co-PDs, beyond those required for genuine collaboration, is discouraged.
- (5) Other Possible Sponsors (Block 21.). List the names or acronyms of all other public or private sponsors including other agencies within USDA to which your application has been or might be sent. In the event you decide to send your application to another organization or agency at a later date, you must inform the identified CSREES program contact as soon as practicable. Submitting your application to other potential sponsors will not prejudice its review by CSREES; however, submitting the same (i.e., duplicate) application to another CSREES program is not permissible.

(b) Page B

Page B should be submitted only with the original signature copy of the application and should be placed as the last page of the original copy of the application. This page contains personal data on the PD(s). CSREES requests this information in order to monitor the operation of its review and awards processes. This page will not be duplicated or used during the review process. Please note that failure to submit this information will in no way affect consideration of your application.

3. Table of Contents

For consistency and ease in locating information, each application must contain a detailed Table of Contents immediately following the Proposal Cover Page. The Table of Contents should contain page numbers for each component of the application. Page numbering should begin with the first page of the Project Description.

4. Project Summary (Form CSREES-2003)

The application must contain a Project Summary, Form CSREES-2003. The summary should be approximately 250 words, contained within the box, placed immediately after the Table of Contents, and not numbered. It should be self-contained and should briefly describe the problem or opportunity, project objectives, and the effort in simple terms that can be understood by a diverse audience including the general public, university personnel, various public and private organizations, and budget staff. The Project Summary should include the title of the project and no other identifiers such as PD(s) names or institutions. The project summary must indicate which category of funding the authors are seeking resources from: (a) research only, (b) extension only, or (c) joint research-extension. For the joint research-extension category, the project summary statement must indicate how many dollars are being requested from each respective source (Smith-Lever versus P.L. 89-106). The importance of a concise, informative Project Summary cannot be overemphasized. If there are more than three co-PDs for an application, please list additional co-PDs on a separate sheet of paper (with appropriate information) and attach to the Project Summary (Form CSREES-2003).

5. Response to Previous Review

This requirement only applies to "Resubmitted Applications" and "Resubmitted Renewal Applications", as described under Part II, B., Types of Applications. PDs must include a summary that clearly states how they responded (revisions, rebuttals, etc.) to the previous review panel's suggestions. This summary should be no more than one page, titled "RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS REVIEW," which is to be placed directly after the Project Summary, Form CSREES-2003.

6. Project Description

Subsections (a) through (c) should not exceed fifteen pages in total. Subsection (e) should not exceed three pages. This restriction has been established to ensure fair and equitable competition. The Project Description must include all of the following:

(a) Problem, Background and Justification

Describe why current technologies and practices are inadequate and how the proposed approach will help to improve or implement the pest management system and address the specific need(s) identified by growers and other stakeholders in the Northeastern Region. Cite the needs assessment evaluation(s) used to formulate this project (e.g., National IPM Initiative Phase I project reports, stakeholder group recommendations, the 1995 statewide needs assessment database, or other documented needs assessment evaluations). Address the specific needs identified in this solicitation and identify the relative importance of the strategy(ies) to an improved pest management system in the region/area, and the potential applicability of the proposed approach to other production regions. Review ongoing or completed work (local/regional/national) that is relevant and include references. Describe how previous work funded by the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program or other sources will contribute to the proposed project.

(b) Objectives

Provide clear, concise, complete, and logically arranged statement(s) of the specific aims of the proposed effort along with details of the anticipated accomplishments. In combined applications, the research and extension objectives should be delineated separately.

(c) Approach and Procedures

Describe how each of the stated objectives will be reached. Include appropriate experimental design and experimental units, reference methods to be used, and appropriate statistical analysis. Include a timetable for the start and completion of each phase of the project. For a combined research-extension application, describe how the project will be managed, particularly how coordination between research and extension components will be achieved and maintained. The degree of collaboration should be specifically addressed for multi-disciplinary, multi-organizational, and multi-state collaboration, respectively. If collaboration in any of these three aspects is inappropriate, justification must be provided.

(d) Cooperation and Institutional Units Involved

Identify each institutional unit contributing to the project. Identify each state in a multiple-state application and designate the lead state. When appropriate, the project should be coordinated with the efforts of other state and/or national programs. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each institutional unit of the project team, if applicable.

(e) Implementation and Evaluation Plans

The Implementation and Evaluation Plans portion of the application should not exceed three pages in length.

(1) Research Projects: Applications must describe how the tactic or system, once developed, might be incorporated into an existing crop management program on a large scale.

(2) Extension Projects and Joint Research-Extension Projects: Applications must provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project. The evaluation plan should include specific evaluation objectives and indicators (e.g., adoption rate, number of acres impacted, pesticide use, risk reduction, profitability) that will be used to measure impacts and outcomes resulting from the project. Evaluation plans that include surveys should indicate survey expertise of investigators and/or describe the survey methodology that will be used.

7. References

All references to works cited should be complete, include titles and all co-authors, and conform to an acceptable journal format.

8. Appendices to Project Description

Appendices to the Project Description are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent page limitations.

9. Key Personnel

The following should be included, as applicable:

- (a) The roles and responsibilities of each PD and/or collaborator should be clearly described; and
- (b) A current curriculum vitae of the PD and each co-PD, senior associate, and other professional personnel. This section should include vitae of all key persons who are expected to work on the project, whether or not CSREES funds are sought for their support. The vitae should be limited

to two pages each in length, excluding publications listings. The vitae should include a presentation of academic and research credentials, as applicable, e.g., earned degrees, teaching experience, employment history, professional activities, honors and awards, and grants received. A chronological list of all publications in refereed journals during the past four years, including those in press, must be provided for each project member for whom a curriculum vitae is provided. Also list only those non-refereed technical publications that have relevance to the proposed project. All authors should be listed in the same order as they appear on each paper cited, along with the title and complete reference as these usually appear in journals.

10. Collaborative Arrangements

If it will be necessary to enter into formal consulting, collaborative, or subcontractual arrangements with others, such arrangements should be fully explained and justified. If the consultant(s) or collaborator(s) are known at the time of application, vitae or resume should be provided. In addition, evidence (e.g., letter of support) should be provided that the collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. The applicant also will be required to provide additional information on consultants and collaborators in the budget portion of the application.

11. Conflict-of-Interest List (Form CSREES-2007)

A Conflict-of-Interest List, Form CSREES-2007, must be provided for all individuals who have submitted vitae. Each Form CSREES-2007 should list alphabetically, by the last names, the full names of the individuals in the following categories: (a) all co-authors on publications within the past four years, including pending publications and submissions; (b) all collaborators on projects within the past four years, including current and planned collaborations; (c) all thesis or postdoctoral advisees/advisors within the past four years; and (d) all persons in your field with whom you have had a consulting or financial arrangement within the past four years, who stand to gain by seeing the project funded. This form is necessary to assist program staff in excluding from application review those individuals who have conflicts of interest with the personnel in the grant application. The program contact must be informed of any additional conflicts of interest that arise after the application is submitted.

12. Budget

(a) Budget Form (Form CSREES-2004 or CSREES-55)

Each application must include a detailed Budget Form for each year of requested support and a budget form that summarizes total project costs for the duration of the project. NOTE: Use the standard Budget Form (CSREES-2004) to propose Research or Extension projects (see Part II, C., Project Types); use the modified Budget Form (CSREES-55) to propose Joint Research-Extension projects. For joint research-extension applications, applicants should distinguish whether the funds will be used for research or extension activities in the appropriate columns of the budget. The budget instructions included in the CSREES Application Forms Package are applicable to both budget forms. The budget form may be reproduced as needed. Funds may be requested under any of the categories listed on the form, provided that the item or service for which support is requested is allowable under the authorizing legislation, the applicable statutes, regulations, and Federal cost principles, and these program guidelines, and can be justified as necessary for the successful conduct of the proposed project. Applicants must include a budget narrative to justify their budget requests (see Part IV, B., 13.), Budget Narrative, for details).

The project budget should include expenses for one PD to attend an annual meeting of the Northeastern Region Research, Extension, and Academic Programs Committee on IPM for purposes of presenting a termination report. The IPM Budget Form enables applicants to include information pertaining to research, extension, or joint research-extension projects. The forms should be completed as they pertain to the type of application being submitted.

(b) Budget Narrative

A detailed budget narrative must be included for each application. All budget categories, with the exception of Indirect Costs, for which support is requested, must be individually listed (with costs) in the same order as the budget and justified on a separate sheet of paper and placed immediately behind the Budget Form. If consulting, collaborative arrangements, or subcontractual arrangements are included in the application, these arrangements should be fully explained and justified. The rate of pay for any consultant must be included, if known at the time of application. Letters of intent or other evidence should be provided to show that collaborators have agreed to participate. A proposed statement of work, vita, and a budget for each arrangement involving the transfer of substantive programmatic work or the provision of financial assistance to a third party must be supplied. In multi-state applications, a budget and budget narrative must be included for each state involved. The lead state and each participating state must be identified.

(c) Indirect Costs

See Part IV, D., for indirect cost restrictions.

13. Current and Pending Support (Form CSREES-2005)

All applications must contain Form CSREES-2005 listing other current public or private support (including in-house support) to which personnel (i.e., individuals submitting vitae in response to 9(b) of this part) identified in the application have committed portions of their time, whether or not salary support for person(s) involved is included in the budget. Please follow the instructions provided on this form. Concurrent submission of identical or similar applications to the possible sponsors will not prejudice application review or evaluation by the CSREES. However, an application that duplicates or overlaps substantially with an application already reviewed and funded (or to be funded) by another organization or agency will not be funded under this program. Please note that the project being proposed should be included in the Pending section of the form.

14. Assurance Statement(s) (Form CSREES-2008)

A number of situations encountered in the conduct of projects require special assurances, supporting documentation, etc., before funding can be approved for the project. In addition to any other situation that may exist with regard to a particular project, applications involving any of the following elements must comply with the additional requirement, as applicable.

(a) Recombinant DNA or RNA Research

As stated in 7 CFR Part 3015.205 (b)(3), all key personnel identified in the application and all endorsing officials of the proposing organization are required to comply with the guidelines established by the National Institutes of Health entitled, "Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules," as revised. If your project proposes to use recombinant DNA or

RNA techniques, you must so indicate by checking the "yes" box in Block 20. of Form CSREES-2002 (the Proposal Cover Page) and by completing Section A. of Form CSREES-2008. For applicable applications recommended for funding, Institutional Biosafety Committee approval is required before CSREES funds will be released. Please refer to the application forms for further instructions.

(b) Animal Care

Responsibility for the humane care and treatment of live vertebrate animals used in any grant project supported with funds provided by CSREES rests with the performing organization.

Where a project involves the use of living vertebrate animals for experimental purposes, all key personnel identified in an application and all endorsing officials of the proposing organization are required to comply with the applicable provisions of the Animal Welfare Act of 1966, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.), and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Secretary in 9 CFR Parts 1, 2, 3, and 4 pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of these animals. If your project will involve these animals, you should check "yes" in Block 20. of Form CSREES-2002 and complete Section B. of Form CSREES-2008. In the event a project involving the use of live vertebrate animals results in a grant award, funds will be released only after the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee has approved the project. Please refer to the application forms for further instructions.

(c) Protection of Human Subjects

Responsibility for safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects used in any grant project supported with funds provided by CSREES rests with the performing organization.

Guidance on this issue is contained in the National Research Act, Pub. L. No. 93-348, as amended, and implementing regulations promulgated by the Department under 7 CFR Part 1c. If you propose to use human subjects in your project, you should check the "yes" box in Block 20. of Form CSREES-2002 and complete Section C. of Form CSREES-2008. In the event a project involving human subjects at risk is recommended for award, funds will be released only after the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved the research plan and CSREES has accepted documentation of the IRB approval. Please refer to the application forms for additional instructions.

15. Certifications

Note that by signing Form CSREES-2002 the applicant is providing the certifications required by 7 CFR Part 3017, regarding Debarment and Suspension and Drug-Free Workplace, and 7 CFR Part 3018, regarding Lobbying. The certification forms are included in the application package for informational purposes only. These forms should not be submitted with the application since by signing Form CSREES-2002 your organization is providing the required certifications. If the project will involve a subcontractor or consultant, the subcontractor/consultant should submit a Form AD-1048, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions, to the grantee organization for retention in their records. This form should not be submitted with the application or to USDA.

16. Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Form CSREES-2006)

As outlined in 7 CFR Part 3407 (the CSREES regulations implementing NEPA), the environmental data for any proposed project is to be provided to CSREES so that CSREES may determine whether any further action is needed. In some cases, however, the preparation of environmental data may not be required. Certain categories of actions are excluded from the requirements of NEPA.

In order for CSREES to determine whether any further action is needed with respect to NEPA, pertinent information regarding the possible environmental impacts of a particular project is necessary; therefore, Form CSREES-2006, NEPA Exclusions Form, must be included in the application indicating whether the applicant is of the opinion that the project falls within a categorical exclusion and the reasons therefore. If it is the applicant's opinion that the proposed project falls within the categorical exclusions, the specific exclusion(s) must be identified.

Even though a project may fall within the categorical exclusions, CSREES may determine that an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for an activity, if substantial controversy on environmental grounds exists or if other extraordinary conditions or circumstances are present which may cause such activity to have a significant environmental effect.

C. Submission Dates and Times

Letters of intent to submit an application must be received by close of business (COB) on November 3, 2003 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time) in order to submit an application for consideration. An application will not be accepted if a letter of intent was not submitted in accordance with instructions in this RFA. Applications must be received by COB on December 1, 2003 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time). Applications received after this deadline will not be considered for funding.

D. Funding Restrictions

CSREES has determined that grant funds awarded under this authority may not be used for the renovation or refurbishment of research, education, or extension space; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such space; or the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of buildings or facilities.

Pursuant to Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1997 (91 Stat. 981), indirect costs are unallowable costs under Section 2(c)(1)(B) projects and Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever funded projects, and no funds will be approved for this purpose. Costs that are a part of the institution's indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable.

E. Other Submission Requirements

1. What to Submit

The letter of intent to submit an application must include the working title of the project, PD(s) and institution(s), likely cooperator(s) and their institution(s), crops and pests addressed, and the project objectives (one or two sentences per objective; can be modified in the application). The letter of intent must not exceed one page. Details of the final application may vary from those in the letter of intent. The purpose of the letter is to assist in technical review panel identification

and recruiting. It will not be used in the application evaluation. The letter of intent is the only part of the application packet that may be submitted electronically or by facsimile.

The original and twelve (12) copies of the application must be submitted. The original and twelve (12) copies of the Relevance Statement must accompany these documents. Do not staple or otherwise attach the Relevance Statement to the application. All copies of the application must be submitted in one package. No application will be considered for funding if:

- (a) It violates stated page limits or other specified format parameters such as line spacing;
- (b) The proposed budget exceeds budget maximums;
- (c) The application does not include the required authorizing signatures;
- (d) The complete application packet, including the Relevance Statement, is not received by the specific deadline; or
- (e) The applicant failed to meet the letter of intent requirements.

2. Where to Submit

Letters of intent may be submitted via facsimile to: (814) 863-8175, or e-mailed to: jea@psu.edu. Applications transmitted by facsimile or e-mail will not be accepted. The address for letters of intent and applications submitted via the U.S. Postal Service, express mail, or overnight courier service is:

Dr. John E. Ayers
Grants Manager, NE-IPM
The Pennsylvania State University
114 Buckhout Laboratory
University Park, PA 16802

Telephone: (814) 865-7776

The receipt of all applications will be acknowledged by e-mail or U.S. Postal Service letter. Applicants are strongly encouraged to provide accurate addresses, where designated, on Form CSREES-2002. If the applicant does not receive an acknowledgment within 60 days of the submission deadline, please contact the NE-IPM Grants Manager. Once the application has been assigned an application number, please cite that number on all future correspondence.

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

A. General

Subsection (c)(5) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), as amended by Section 212 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)(5)) requires grantees to arrange for scientific peer review of their proposed research activities and merit review of their proposed extension and education activities in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority. Review by the grantee is not automatically required for renewal or supplemental grants as defined in 7 CFR 3400.6. A subsequent grant award will require a new review if, according to CSREES, the funded project has changed significantly, other scientific discoveries have affected the project, or the need for the project has changed. Note that a new review is necessary when applying for another standard or continuation grant after expiration of the grant term. The application review process conducted by the Northeastern Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program fulfills the scientific peer review and merit review requirements. Additional reviews are not necessary.

Scientific peer review is an evaluation of a proposed project for technical quality and relevance to regional or national goals performed by experts with the scientific knowledge and technical skills to conduct the proposed research work. Peer reviewers may be selected from an applicant organization or from outside the organization, but shall not include principals, collaborators or others involved in the preparation of the application under review.

Merit review is an evaluation of a proposed project or elements of a proposed program whereby the technical quality and relevance to regional or national goals are assessed. Peers with the appropriate expertise shall perform the merit review. Merit reviewers may not include principals, collaborators or others involved in the preparation of the application under review.

B. Evaluation Criteria

Application review will be handled at the regional level using a two-part process. The Relevance Panel (Merit Review) will use only the Relevance Statement to review project relevance to regional priorities. The Technical Panel will use applications, but not Relevance Statements, to review project technical merit and feasibility. Successful applications must be strong in both areas. To be funded, an application must meet minimum standards set by both panels. The NE-IPM Grant Manager will combine results of both reviews and present the results to a committee of Extension and Experiment Station Directors from the Northeastern Region. The committee will use this information to recommend project funding, including level and duration, to CSREES. Subsections 1. and 2., below, describe the review criteria:

1. Relevance Review

Only the Relevance Statement (described in Part IV, B., 1(e)) will be used to determine proposed projects' relevance to program priorities. The panel will consist of ten reviewers from within the Northeastern Region representing diverse perspectives including production, consultants, environmental advocacy, and consumer advocacy; public sector and private sector; research and extension; and traditional pest management disciplines.

For research, extension, and joint research-extension projects (as described in Part II, C. , 1-3), criteria used for this evaluation will include:

Criteria	Possible Points
<p>Explicit link to stakeholder-identified need, including the identification (by group, not by name) of stakeholders who expressed the need.</p> <p><u>Level of stakeholder identification as a priority</u> <u>Maximum score</u></p> <p>No mention of stakeholders in setting the priority 0</p> <p>Mention of stakeholders but no documentation 5</p> <p>Clearly documented as priority of an important stakeholder group 10</p> <p>Clearly documented as an important priority by multiple stakeholder groups 15</p>	15
<p>Focus of the project on development, promotion, or implementation of non-pesticidal tactics</p> <p><u>Level of non-pesticidal focus</u> <u>Maximum Score</u></p> <p>Will not impact risk in any way 0</p> <p>Has pesticide management focus and could significantly reduce or improve risk 8</p> <p>Focused on non-pesticidal tactics and could significantly reduce or improve risk 15</p>	15
<p>Level of multi-state involvement within the Northeastern Region.</p> <p><u>Level of collaboration</u> <u>Maximum score</u></p> <p>Only 1 state involved and only 1 state would benefit 0</p> <p>Only 1 state involved but several may benefit 5</p> <p>More than 1 state involved and several states would clearly benefit 10</p>	10
<p>Potential for the project to address the Northeastern Region's base priorities (see Part I, B., 4. for more detail).</p> <p>Environmental stewardship and risk management 15</p> <p>Importance and value of the crop system to the Region 15</p> <p>Importance of the pest to the crop system 10</p> <p>Potential for implementation 20</p>	60
Total possible points for Relevance Review:	100

For critical step projects (as described in Part II, C. , 4.), criteria used for this evaluation will include:

Criteria	Possible Points
<p>Explicit link to stakeholder-identified need, including the identification (by group, not by name) of stakeholders who expressed the need.</p> <p><u>Level of stakeholder identification as a priority</u> <u>Maximum score</u></p> <p>No mention of stakeholders in setting the priority 0</p> <p>Mention of stakeholders but no documentation 5</p> <p>Clearly documented as priority of an important stakeholder group 10</p> <p>Clearly documented as an important priority by multiple stakeholder groups 15</p>	15
<p>Focus of the project on development, promotion, or implementation of non-pesticidal tactics</p> <p><u>Level of non-pesticidal focus</u> <u>Maximum Score</u></p> <p>Will not impact risk in any way 0</p> <p>Has pesticide management focus and could significantly reduce or improve risk 8</p> <p>Focused on non-pesticidal tactics and could significantly reduce or improve risk 15</p>	15
<p>Level of multi-state involvement within the Northeastern Region.</p> <p><u>Level of collaboration</u> <u>Maximum score</u></p> <p>Only 1 state involved and only 1 state would benefit 5</p> <p>Only 1 state involved but several may benefit 10</p>	10
<p>Potential for the project to address the Northeastern Region's base priorities (see Part I, B., 4. for more detail).</p> <p>Environmental stewardship and risk management 15</p> <p>Importance of the pest to the crop system 15</p> <p>Potential for positive near-term impact 30</p>	60
Total possible points for Relevance Review:	100

2. Technical Review

A technical panel will review, evaluate, score and rank the applications for technical merit. The panel will consist of research and extension personnel from outside the Northeastern Region. The panel will include representatives from each of the appropriate major pest disciplines.

For research, extension, and joint research-extension projects (as described in Part II, C. , 1-3), criteria used for this review are:

Criteria	Possible Points
<p>Appropriate objectives, design, and methodology.</p> <p>Considerations include:</p> <p>Overall scientific value</p> <p>Will the planned research make a significant contribution to new knowledge or provide a better understanding of existing knowledge?</p> <p>Is the problem clearly presented and literature review adequate?</p> <p>Do the objectives address the problem presented?</p> <p>Are the methods appropriate and sufficient to accomplish the stated objectives?</p> <p>What is the probability of success?</p> <p>Can the objectives be accomplished in the stated time frame?</p> <p>Does the project, as proposed, duplicate on-going projects at other institutions?</p>	60
Appropriate budget	10
Professional competence of the project team	10
Degree of interdisciplinary or multi-institutional collaboration or appropriate justification for lack of interdisciplinary or multi-institutional collaboration	10
<p>Evaluation and Implementation Plans</p> <p><u>Research Applications:</u></p> <p>Appropriate implementation plan</p> <p>--or--</p> <p><u>Research-Extension and Extension Applications:</u></p> <p>Appropriate strategy/process to evaluate the success of the project</p>	10
Total possible points for Technical Review:	100

For critical step projects (as described in Part II, C. , 4.), criteria used for this review are:

Criteria	Possible Points
<p>Appropriate objectives, design, and methodology.</p> <p>Considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall technical value Will the planned research make a important contribution to new knowledge or provide a better understanding of existing knowledge? Is the problem clearly presented and literature review appropriate? Do the objectives address the problem presented? Are the methods appropriate and sufficient to accomplish the stated objectives? What is the probability of success? Can the objectives be accomplished in the stated time frame? Does the project, as proposed, duplicate on-going projects at other institutions? 	65
Appropriate budget	10
Professional competence of the project team	10
Potential for near-term impact	15
Total possible points for Technical Review:	100

C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

During the peer evaluation process, extreme care will be taken to prevent any actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may impact review or evaluation. For the purpose of determining conflicts of interest, the academic and administrative autonomy of an institution shall be determined by reference to the current Higher Education Directory, published by Higher Education Publications, Inc., 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 648, Falls Church, VA 22042. Phone: (703) 532-2300. Web site: <http://www.hepinc.com>.

Names of submitting institutions and individuals, as well as application content and peer evaluations, will be kept confidential, except to those involved in the review process, to the extent permitted by law. In addition, the identities of peer reviewers will remain confidential throughout the entire review process. Therefore, the names of the reviewers will not be released to applicants.

PART VI--AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General

Within the limit of funds available for such purpose, the awarding official of CSREES shall make grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose applications are judged most meritorious under the procedures set forth in this RFA. The date specified by the awarding official of CSREES as the effective date of the grant shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support and funds are appropriated for such purpose, unless otherwise permitted by law. It should be noted that the project need not be initiated on the grant effective date, but as soon thereafter as practical so project goals may be attained within the funded project period. All funds granted by CSREES under this RFA shall be expended solely for the purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's assistance regulations (parts 3015 and 3019 of 7 CFR). CRIS Forms AD-416 "Research Work Unit/Project Description-Research Resume" and AD-417 "Research Work Unit/Project Description-Classification of Research", apply only to the P.L. 89-106 funds and will be requested if an application is identified for funding.

B. Organizational Management Information

Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one-time basis as part of the responsibility determination prior to the award of a grant identified under this RFA, if such information has not been provided previously under this or another CSREES program. CSREES will provide copies of forms recommended for use in fulfilling these requirements as part of the preaward process. Although an applicant may be eligible based on its status as one of these entities, there are factors which may exclude an applicant from receiving Federal financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under this program (e.g., debarment or suspension of an individual involved or a determination that an applicant is not responsible based on submitted organizational management information).

C. Award Notice

The grant award document shall include at a minimum the following:

1. Legal name and address of performing organization or institution to whom the Administrator has awarded a grant under the terms of this request for applications;
2. Title of project;
3. Name(s) and institution(s) of PDs chosen to direct and control approved activities;
4. Identifying grant number assigned by the Department;
5. Project period, specifying the amount of time the Department intends to support the project without requiring recompetition for funds;
6. Total amount of Departmental financial assistance approved by the Administrator during the project period;
7. Legal authority(ies) under which the grant is awarded;

8. Appropriate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number;
9. Approved budget plan for categorizing allocable project funds to accomplish the stated purpose of the grant award; and
10. Other information or provisions deemed necessary by CSREES to carry out its respective granting activities or to accomplish the purpose of a particular grant.

D. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Several Federal statutes and regulations apply to grant applications considered for review and to project grants awarded under this program. These include, but are not limited to:

- 7 CFR Part 1, subpart A—USDA implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.
- 7 CFR Part 3—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-129 regarding debt collection.
- 7 CFR Part 15, subpart A—USDA implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.
- 7 CFR Part 3015—USDA Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations, implementing OMB directives (i.e., OMB Circular Nos. A-21 and A-122) and incorporating provisions of 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308 (formerly the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, Pub. L. No. 95-224), as well as general policy requirements applicable to recipients of Departmental financial assistance.
- 7 CFR Part 3017—USDA implementation of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).
- 7 CFR Part 3018—USDA implementation of Restrictions on Lobbying. Imposes prohibitions and requirements for disclosure and certification related to lobbying on recipients of Federal contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and loans.
- 7 CFR Part 3019—USDA implementation of OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.
- 7 CFR Part 3052—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-profit Organizations.
- 7 CFR Part 3407—CSREES procedures to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.
- 29 U.S.C. 794 (section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973) and 7 CFR Part 15b (USDA implementation of statute)— prohibiting discrimination based upon physical or mental handicap in Federally assisted programs.
- 35 U.S.C. 200 et seq.—Bayh-Dole Act, controlling allocation of rights to inventions made by employees of small business firms and domestic nonprofit organizations, including universities, in Federally assisted programs (implementing regulations are contained in 37 CFR Part 401).

E. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements

In addition to the reporting requirements identified in CSREES Terms and Conditions (which is part of the award package), successful applicants will be required to submit a detailed yearly progress report and, upon completion of the project, a final technical report to the Northeastern Region's Grant Manager.

Progress reports for the NE-IPM should be 1 - 2 pages (12-point type or larger, one-inch margins). In the report, the PD will be expected to demonstrate that progress has been made on the project; to highlight important findings and recommendations made as a result of the project progress to date; to fully describe changes in objectives, procedures, and the time table for completion of the project; etc. Failure to submit a progress report will result in a recommendation to CSREES to reduce or terminate funding. The Grant Manager will contact the PD at the time the report is due; initial contact will be approximately one year after the grant starting date.

Final reports will be due 90 days after the project termination date. Final reports must be comprehensive and should include more data, figures, etc., than normally would occur in a typical refereed publication or extension publication.

PDs are required to acknowledge CSREES and the Northeastern Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program in all publications or other products that result from funds that are awarded. Reprints or copies of all publications would be appreciated.

PART VII—PROGRAM CONTACT

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact Dr. John E. Ayers; Grant Manager, NE-IPM; The Pennsylvania State University; 114 Buckhout Laboratory; University Park, PA 16802; Telephone: (814) 865-7776; Fax: (814) 863-8175; E-mail: jea@psu.edu.

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION

A. Access to Review Information

A summary of review panel comments will be sent to the applicant PD after the review process has been completed.

B. Use of Funds; Changes

1. Delegation of Fiscal Responsibility

Unless the terms and conditions of the grant state otherwise, the grantee may not in whole or in part delegate or transfer to another person, institution, or organization the responsibility for use or expenditure of grant funds.

2. Changes in Project Plans

The permissible changes by the grantee, PD(s), or other key project personnel in the approved project grant shall be limited to changes in methodology, techniques, or other similar aspects of the project to expedite achievement of the project's approved goals. If the grantee or the PD(s) is uncertain as to whether a change complies with this provision, the question must be referred to the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) for a final determination. The ADO is the signatory of the award document, not the program contact.

(a) Changes in approved goals or objectives shall be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes. In no event shall requests for such changes be approved which are outside the scope of the original approved project.

(b) Changes in approved project leadership or the replacement or reassignment of other key project personnel shall be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes.

(c) Transfers of actual performance of the substantive programmatic work in whole or in part and provisions for payment of funds, whether or not Federal funds are involved, shall be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such transfers, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of the grant.

(d) Changes in Project Period: The project period may be extended by CSREES without additional financial support, for such additional period(s) as the ADO determines may be necessary to complete or fulfill the purposes of an approved project, but in no case shall the total project period exceed five years. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the grantee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of a grant.

(e) Changes in Approved Budget: Changes in an approved budget must be requested by the grantee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to instituting such changes if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or grant award.

C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards

When an application results in a grant, it becomes a part of the record of CSREES transactions, available to the public upon specific request. Information that the Secretary determines to be of a confidential, privileged, or proprietary nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have considered as confidential, privileged or proprietary should be clearly marked within the application. The original copy of an application that does not result in a grant will be retained by the Agency for a period of one year. Other copies will be destroyed. Such an application will be released only with the consent of the applicant or to the extent required by law. An application may be withdrawn at any time prior to the final action thereon.

D. Regulatory Information

For the reasons set forth in the final Rule-related Notice to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V (48 FR 29114, June 24, 1983), this program is excluded from the scope of the Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524-0039.